DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 579 EC 302 126

AUTHOR	Gallagher, James J.; Shields, Mary J.
TITLE	Components of a Comprehensive Statewide Inservice Training Program.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Carolina Policy Studies Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Sep 90
CONTRACT	G0087C3065
NOTE	7p.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disabilities; *Early Intervention; Educational Legislation; Federal Legislation; Government Role; Infants; *Inservice Education; Preschool Education; Program Development; *Staff Development; State Programs; Statewide Planning; *Systems Development; Toddlers
IDENTIFIERS	*Education of the Handicapped Act 1986 (Part H)

ABSTRACT

This report suggests components for a comprehensive statewide inservice training program for personnel involved in implementing the Part H program of Public Law 99-457. These components include: (1) establishment of an inservice program as a requirement for each state participating in Part H; (2) promotion of a statewide comprehensive system of personnel development addressing all disciplines and levels; (3) joint responsibility of the agencies involved; (4) policies focused on training for entry skills and continuing competency; (5) geographically accessible and culturally relevant training; (6) inclusion of private service providers in training; (7) use of the multidisciplinary service model as the unit of training; and (8) focus on case management and collaboration with families. Barriers to inservice training development include limited fiscal and personnel resources for training, previously established policies, crisis orientation as the mode of operation, lack of evidence of effectiveness of inservice training, the poor example of unqualified personnel in existing programs, and professionals' need for identification with their own disciplines. Incentives are needed to encourage states to develop a system of inservice training. The role of the Federal Government should be to provide a model for the states to develop and maintain a comprehensive system of personnel development. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED357579

September, 1990
CAROLINA POLICY STUDIES PROGRAM
James J. Gallagher and Mary J. Shields

COMPONENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

In 1989 a small group of people knowledgeable about personnel preparation met for a policy options conference at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The goals of this conference were to identify key policy issues, to determine a full range of policy options to deal with these issues, to explore consequences of these options, and to share the results with others.

The three policy issues in the area of personnel preparation identified as the most significant were:

- What policies can be developed to extend and expand training resources and populations of trainees?
- How can states develop standards that address all personnel, including those already in the field?
- Who will provide inservice and preservice training?

The full range of responses to these questions is included in a larger report (Gallagher, Shields, & Staples, 1990). This brief report focuses on the group's suggested components for a comprehensive statewide inservice training program.

Suggested Components for a Comprehensive Statewide Inservice Training Program

The group viewed as tremendously important the area of inservice training in the implementation of the Part H program. Therefore, in dealing with the third issue (Who will provide inservice and preservice training?) the participants decided to generate components for a comprehensive statewide system of inservice training. A summary of these components follows.

1. <u>THERE NEEDS TO BE A POLICY TO ESTABLISH AN INSERVICE PROGRAM STATED AS A REQUIREMENT FOR EACH STATE PARTICIPATING IN P.L. 99-457, PART H.</u>

   The recommendation for this policy, with special emphasis on allocation, stresses the fact that inservice training is seen as critical to the success of the Part H program, regardless of what other personnel preparation commitments are made.

2. <u>A STRUCTURE SHOULD BE DEVELOPED TO PROMOTE THE STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT. AND LEADERSHIP FOR THIS EFFORT MUST BE DESIGNATED. THE STRUCTURE NEEDS TO ADDRESS ALL DISCIPLINES AND LEVELS (PROFESSIONAL AND PARAPROFESSIONAL).</u>

   (A) Efforts should be coordinated among those agencies developing certification and training policy, and among disciplines, and should not impose two or more sets of

EC 302126

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(B) The structure needs to provide for systematic, ongoing and self-renewing needs assessment and technical assistance.

(C) There should be identification of resources to meet these needs.

(D) There should be a mechanism for making decisions.

(E) There needs to be participation by the stakeholders (e.g., parents and representatives of the service delivery system), by those who provide and consume the services.

(F) There needs to be a conceptual framework to guide decision making and resource allocation.

Unless there is both stakeholder participation and designated leadership, the experience of this group suggests that the program will wax and wane with budget availability and the accident of temporary leadership or political climate.

3. THERE SHOULD BE JOINT REPONSIBILITY OF THE AGENCIES INVOLVED.

Coordination, to be effective, must include a fair allocation of responsibility and decision making and this is easier said than done. Specific interagency agreements may be necessary to ensure such cooperation.

4. THERE NEED TO BE POLICIES FOCUSED ON TRAINING FOR ENTRY SKILLS AND CONTINUING COMPETENCY.

A continuous process of personnel preparation is needed at both preservice and inservice levels to address a range of competencies. Training should be designed systematically to meet the needs of professionals and paraprofessionals at all levels of experience.

5. TRAINING SHOULD BE GEOGRAPHICALLY ACCESSIBLE AND CULTURALLY RELEVANT FOR THE TRAINEES.

Accessibility to the trainees can help ensure the completion of a training unit. The diverse needs of handicapped infants and toddlers and their families require that attention in the training program be paid to important cultural differences.

Training must be culturally relevant to the trainees, and also culturally sensitive to the needs of various groups with which the trainees may work in the future. The training should incorporate communication skills that will foster parent-professional collaboration regardless of cultural differences.

6. TRAINING NEEDS TO INCLUDE PRIVATE SERVICE PROVIDERS.

The private sector needs to be included as trainers and trainees in any comprehensive personnel preparation program. In the comprehensive, interdisciplinary system of services required by Part H, the private sector must be involved in an ongoing system of feedback and consultation, hence the

importance of including that sector in training.

7. THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY SERVICE MODEL SHOULD BE THE UNIT OF TRAINING. THIS CONCEPT SHOULD BE/CAN BE INCLUDED IN PROGRAM POLICIES.

   In order to teach interdisciplinary cooperation within the service units such behavior should be modelled in the training activities. Interdisciplinary services are easy to discuss but hard to implement, so models of effective practice are the best teaching device.

8. TRAINING SHOULD ADDRESS CASE MANAGEMENT AND COLLABORATION WITH FAMILIES. TWO CRITICAL AREAS ADDRESSED IN THE LAW THAT ARE NOT THE PROVINCE OF ANY ONE DISCIPLINE.

   There are many new responsibilities accompanying the Part H legislation that are relevant to all professional disciplines. Inservice training should focus particularly upon such key responsibilities.

CPSP Comments

The members of this group thought that it was important to anticipate barriers that stand in the way of effective personnel development, so that states in the process of implementing Part H can plan to overcome them. The barriers that are particularly applicable to inservice training development are discussed below.

The choice among the diversity of preparation models is made more difficult by limited fiscal and personnel resources for training.

Previously established policies can be barriers (e.g., policies that dictate the percentage of time that must be spent in direct services) to adequate provision of training. There needs to be recognition of the need to involve service personnel in training or to allot time for them to participate.

Crisis orientation as the mode of operation may seem to meet immediate personnel needs through inservice training programs. Long term planning, however, is necessary to maintain effective inservice as well as preservice programs.

Lack of evidence of effectiveness of inservice training demonstrates that many new models are needed and should be encouraged.

Personnel in existing programs who are not qualified or certified will present a poor example to new recruits unless there is a specific plan to upgrade their skills and knowledge.

Professionals need identification with their own disciplines despite the desirable aspects of multidisciplinary programs. This tendency should be taken into account in the menu of training opportunities provided.

There must be incentives for states to develop a system of inservice training. In a survey of Deans of schools of education (Gallagher & Staples, 1990) incentives that would increase personnel resources included increased funding, data to reflect the need for positions, and certification requirements to indicate commitment on the part of the states. These same incentives would seem to apply to the development of inservice training programs as well.

Data must reflect the needs of persons already working in the field, and certification requirements must assist in the process of upgrading existing personnel who may not be

qualified or certified. Shortages in the field have been documented, traditional intervention roles have changed, and training programs for those in the field are less than adequate in providing training appropriate to meet the demands of Part H (Paisha & Rennells, 1990).

The components that are critical for effective service delivery must be modelled in any training efforts in order to ensure that the provision of quality services will be maintained over time.

There was general consensus among members of this policy options group that a desirable role for the federal government would be to provide a model for the states to develop and maintain a comprehensive system of personnel development. This model should portray the difficulties and benefits for states in developing comprehensive statewide systems of inservice training.

This brief report is extracted from the CPSP report (Gallagher, J., Shields, M., & Staples, A., 1990. Personnel preparation options: Ideas from a policy options conference. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Policy Studies Program). For further information write: Dr. James J. Gallagher, Director, CPSP, 300 NCNB Plaza, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

PERSONNEL PREPARATION POLICY OPTIONS WORK GROUP PARTICIPANTS

Soosi Baxter
The Institute for Human Development
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ

Talbot Black
National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC

Mary Beth Bruder
Pediatric Research & Training Center
University of Connecticut Health Center
Farmington, CT

Ronald Colarusso
Special Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA

Emily Fenichel
National Center for Clinical Infant Programs
Washington, DC

Norciva Geddie
State Board of Health
Jackson, MS

Linda Gilkerson
Infant MH and Family Studies Program
Erickson Institute
Chicago, IL

Barbara Hanft
American Occupational Therapy Association
Rockville, MD

Kate Kressley
TAP-IN
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN

Jeanette McCollum
Department of Special Education
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL

Carol Nankes
CSPD Clearinghouse
NASDSE
Washington, DC

Sharon Palsha
Carolina Institute on Infant Personnel Preparation
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC

Shirley Sparks
Western Michigan University
Battle Creek, MI

James Gallagher
Gloria Harbin
Nary Shields
Marta Wenger
Carolina Policy Studies Program
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC